

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

The 17th August, 1979

No. 2233-R-79/33810.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 8 of the Punjab Pre-emption Act, 1913, the Governor of Haryana hereby declares that no right of Pre-emption shall exist with respect to the sale of land described in the Schedule below, made on the 15th January and 18th January, 1979, in favour of Sarvshri Ram Lubhaya, Krishan Lal and Satish Kumar, residents of 164, Anaj Mandi, Karnal, for the purposes of setting up Rice-sheller:—

SCHEDULE

| District | Tahsil | Revenue | Estate | Khasra No. | Area | |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | | | Bighas | Biswas |
| Karnal | Karnal | Karnal | 754, 755, | 10848 —, and 756 | 16 | 6 |
| | | | | 10849 — 756 | | |

L. C. GUPTA, Secy.

राजस्व विभाग

युद्ध जागीर

दिनांक 21 अगस्त, 1979

क्रमांक 1114-ज(I)-79/34076.—श्री वरयाम सिंह, पुत्र श्री मंगल सिंह, गोव मनका मनकी, तहसील व ज़िला अमृदाला की दिनांक 15 सितम्बर, 1977 को हुई मूल्य के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यपाल, पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 4 एवं 2 (ए) (1) तथा 3 (1) के अधीन प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री वरयाम सिंह को मुद्दिल 200 रुपये वार्षिक की जागीर जो उसे पंजाब/हरियाणा सरकार को अधिसूचना क्रमांक 9719-जे० एन० (III)-65/11064, दिनांक 18 दिसम्बर, 1965 तथा अधिसूचना क्रमांक 5041-आर-III-70/29505, दिनांक 8 दिसम्बर, 1970 द्वारा मंजूर की गई थी, अब उस की विवाद श्रीमती प्रेम कीर के नाम रवी, 1977 से 200 रुपये वार्षिक की दर से सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अन्तर्गत सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

क्रमांक 1219-ज(I)-79/34072.—श्री मकतूल सिंह, पुत्र श्री नथू सिंह, गांव बापोड़ा, तहसील व ज़िला मिवानी की दिनांक 3 दिसम्बर, 1973, को हुई मूल्य के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यपाल, पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 4 एवं 2(ए) (1) तथा 3(1) के अधीन प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री मकतूल सिंह को मुद्दिल 150 रुपये वार्षिक की जागीर जो उसे हरियाणा सरकार की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 533-ज(I)-76/13314, दिनांक 5 मई, 1976, द्वारा मंजूर की गई थी, अब उसकी विवाद श्रीमती कमला के नाम खरीफ, 1979 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक की दर से सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अन्तर्गत सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

दिनांक 22 अगस्त, 1979

क्रमांक 1225-ज(II)-79/34277.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3(1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों

का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्य पाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्धजागीर उनके नाम के सामने दी गई फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तोंके अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं :—

| क्रमांक | ज़िला | जागीर पाने वाले का नाम | गांव व पता | तहसील | फसल/वर्ष जब से | वार्षिक राशि |
|---------|-------|--|------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | करनाल | श्री किदार नाथ, पुत्र श्री कालू राम | 509/2, पानीपत | पानीपत | रवी, 1973 | सप्तए 150 |
| 2 | ,, | श्री शिव राम, पुत्र श्री उदमी राम | महावटी | ,, | रवी, 1969 जरीफ, 1970 | 100 150 |

रघुनाथ जोशी,
विशेष कार्य अधिकारी, हरियाणा सरकार,
राजस्व विभाग।

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

The 20th August, 1979

No. 7541-Agri. I(3)-79/20309.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the provision of article 309 of the Constitution of India, and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Punjab Subordinate Agricultural Services Rules, 1933.

1. These rules may be called the Punjab Subordinate Agricultural Services (Haryana Amendment) Rules, 1979.

In the Punjab Subordinate Agricultural Services Rules, 1933, in rule 7 in sub-rule (I)(a) for clause (m), the following clause shall be substituted, namely :—

(m) In the case of Clerks—

(i) 20% by promotion from amongst restorers, gestetner operators and Group D employees having at least five years service as such and have passed matriculation examination;

(ii) 80% by direct recruitment and by transfer.”

(b) Clause 'O' shall be omitted.

V.P. JOHAR,

Financial Commissioner and Secy.

DEVELOPMENT AND PANCHAYAT DEPARTMENT

The 20th August, 1979

No. SI (DP)-79/194.—Whereas, in the opinion of the State Government, it is necessary to take over the land measuring 2,432 Kanals 19 Marlas out of Khasra No. 12

| 15 | 16 | 17 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---------|----|----|--------|----|-----------------------------|----|----|--------|
| 3, 4, 7 | 25 | 21 | 14, 24 | 10 | 3, 8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23 | 23 | 40 | 16, 25 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| 41 | 68 | 69/5, | 71 | 75 | 76 |
| 2, 3/1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20 | 17/2 | 5/1, 9, 10, 11, 12 | 7, 25 | 10 | |
| 80 | 81 | | 82 | 83 | |
| 6, 7, 11, 12, 22, | 23, 24, 25/1, 25/2 | 21/1, 22/2, 23 | | 25/3 | |
| 86 | 87 | | 88 | | |
| 11, 20, 21, 22 | 1 to 16, 18 to 25 | 2/1, 2/2, 3 to 7, 8/1, 8/2, 9, 12, 13, | | 96 | |
| | 88 | | | | |
| 14/1, 14/2, 15, 16/1, 16/2, 17, 18, 19, | 22, 23, 24, 25 | | 15, 16, 17 | | |
| | 86 | 75 | 76 | | 92/14, |
| 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, | 13, 16, 18 | | 11, 20, 21 | | |
| 93 | 98 | 99 | | 101 | |
| 18/2, 19/2 | 2, 3, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 | | 3, 8, 12, 13, 18, 19 | | |
| 102 | 103 | 106 | 107 | 108 | |
| 23, 24, 25 | 21, 22, 23, 24 | 25/2 | 21, 22 | 2 to 9, 12 to 18 | |
| 108 | 109 | 110 | | 111 | |
| 23, 24, 25 | 1, 3 to 21, 25 | 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 | 10/2, 11/1, 20/2, 21/1 | | |
| 114 | 115 | 116 | 117 | 118 | |
| 1, 2, 9, 10 | 1, 5, 10 | 2/3, 3, 4, 5, 8 | 1/2, 2, 3, 7/2, 13, 17 | | 5/2 |
| 123 | 124 | 133 | 140 | 143 | |
| 4 | 3, 4, 5 | 128/16, 12/2 | 5, 6, 20/3, 21 | 6, 7, 8, 12 to 19, | |
| 1, 2, 3, 8 | 1 | | | | |
| 143 | | 144 | | 147 | 148 |
| 20/1, 21/2, 22 to 25 | 1, 2, 6, 7, 13 to 25 | 146/1, | 1 to 14 | 3 to 8, | |
| 148 | 149 | | 150 | | |
| 15, 26 | 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22 | 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25/1, 25/2 | | | |
| | 152 | 170 | 171 | 172 | |
| 151/1, 3, 4, 5 | 14, 16/3, 17, 24, 25 | 20/2, 21 | 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25 | | |
| | 173 | | 180 | | |
| 2/1, 1/2, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21 | | 176/1, | 2, 3, 4/1, 9/2, 10, 13 | | |
| | 181 | 182 | | 189 | |
| 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17/2 | 4 to 7, 14 to 17, 20 | 188/5, | 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, | | |
| 189 | 190 | 191 | 240 | | |
| 14, 15 | 13 | 1, 2/1, 10/1 | 2, 4, 8 | 301/1, 302/1, | |
| 6/1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 1 | | | | | |

982
 1, 3
 vested in Gram Panchayat Nara, Block Madianda, District Karnal, to secure proper
 management for better utilization for the benefit of the inhabitants of the said village.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 5 of section 5 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961, and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby takes over the management of the said shamlat land, for a period of seven years.

No. SI (DP)/79 195.—Whereas, in the opinion of the State Government it is necessary to take over the land measuring 1042 Kanals 10 Marlas out of Khasra Nos. 1/25, 1/21, 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18 to 24, 5, 6, 15, 16, 24, 25, 4/2, 5/1, 6/1, 19, 22, 23, 1 to 10/1, 12/1, 13 to 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 1, 2, 1, 8 to 25, 11, 19 to 25, 21, 22, 23, 24, 1, 2, 13, 14, 15, 16, 1, 2, 3, 1 to 24, 1 to 25/2, 1 to 8, 11 to 14, 1 to 10, 14 to 17, 24, 25, 4, 7 vested in Gram Panchayat Ramana Ramani, Block Nilkheri, District Karnal, to secure proper management for better utilisation for the benefit of the inhabitants of the said village.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (5) of section 5 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961, and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby takes over the management of the said Shamlat Land, for a period of seven years.

T. K. BANERJI,
Special Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 16th August, 1979

No. 11(112)-3Lab.-79/8531.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. (i) Managing Director, Haryana, State Co-op. Land Development Bank Ltd., Chandigarh, (ii) The Manager Karnal Primary Co-op. Land Development Bank, Karnal:—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 101 / 1978

between

SHRI KANWAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S (i) MANAGING DIRECTOR, HARYANA STATE CO-OP. LAND DEVELOPMENT BANK LTD., CHANDIGARH (ii) THE MANAGER KARNAL PRIMARY CO-OP. LAND DEVELOPMENT BANK, KARNAL.

Present.—

Shri Madhu Sudan, for the workman.

Shri Manphool Singh, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/KNL/53-77/26110, dated 16th June, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s (i) Managing Director, Haryana State Co-op. Land Development Bank Ltd., Chandigarh. (ii) The Manager, Karnal Primary Co-op. Land Development Bank, Karnal and its workman Shri Kanwar Singh to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the termination of service of Shri Kanwar Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On 20th December, 1978, the case consolidated with reference No. 98 of 1978 and following issues were framed in that case:—

“Whether the workman was not appointed by the competent authority ? If so, to what effect ?”

And fixed the case for evidence of the management. The management settled the case with the workman and produced his letter withdrawing the reference as the workman has been reinstated by the management with effect from 19th February, 1979. Shri Madhu Sudan appeared before me on 25th May, 1979 and confirmed the reinstatement of the workman and withdrew the reference. I, therefore, return this reference without giving my award as the workman has been reinstated by the management and he does not want any further relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated 16th July, 1979

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 1795, dated 31st July, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment, Chandigarh under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 11 (112)-3Lab-79/8627. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Delhi Consultech Private Ltd., Sector 24, Industrial Area, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No 561 of 1978

between

SHRI HARI SHANKAR KHANNA WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. DELHI
CONSULTECH PRIVATE LTD., SECTOR 24, INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Sushil Bhattacharya, for the workman.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/52336, dated 23rd November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Delhi Consultech Private Ltd., Sector 24, Industrial Area, Faridabad and its workman Shri Hari Shankar Khanna, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Shankar Khanna was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Both the parties appeared on 8th March, 1979, 18th April, 1979 and 17th May, 1979 but on 14th June, 1979 the date fixed in presence of the parties, none appeared for the management. The management was waited for upto

11-15 p. m. Then the *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman.

Today the workman examined himself as his own witness and stated that he was employed with the management in the year 1977 and the management terminated his services without any cause, reason or justification and he is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages at the time of termination of his services. He was drawing Rs 450 p. m. as Accounts Assistant. I believe in the *ex parte* statement of the workman and give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages and I order accordingly setting aside termination of his services.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated, the 23rd July, 1979

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 712, dated 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8630.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sita Singh Engineers & Sons, Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 17 of 1979

between

SHRI RAMESHWAR PARSHAD WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SITA SINGH ENGINEERS & SONS, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 1/247-78/942, dated 6th January, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Sita Singh Engineers & Sons, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Rameshwari Parshad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rameshwari Parshad, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 2nd June, 1979 :—

1. Whether the workman has resigned of his own?
2. Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order?
3. Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the parties. On the date fixed the representative for the management stated that the workman has gone away after resigning and he produced documents in support thereof. The representative for the workman was then directed to produce the workman. On

the date fixed for the appearance of the workman, the representative for the workman stated that he has no instructions from the workman. Then the case was dismissed in default.

In view of the above circumstances, I give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

Dated, the 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 719, dated 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8631.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hotel Holiday-Inn, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 171 of 1978

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HOTEL HOLIDAY-INN, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri R. L. Sharma for the workmen.

Shri Shyam Lal for the management.

AWARD

By order No. FD/41-N-78/29690, dated 27th June, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hotel Holiday-Inn, Faridabad and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of dearness allowance? If so, with what details?
2. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of bonus for the year 1974-75 and 1975-76? If so, with what details?
3. Whether the grades and scales of pay for the workmen should be framed? If so, what details?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The representative for the management stated that the management had paid all the workmen fully and finally and have closed the Hotel and all the workmen have left after receiving all their dues. The representative for the workmen did not like to proceed with the reference. I, therefore, give my award that at present there is no dispute between parties and hotel of the management has been closed and all the workmen have left after receiving all their dues.

Dated, the 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 718, dated 3rd Aug., 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11 (112)-3Lab-79/8632.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Pratibha Ceramics Private Limited, Sector 24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA PRESIDING OFFICER INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL HARYANA FARIDABAD

Reference No. 171 of 1979

between

SHRI RAMESHWAR PARSHAD WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S.
PRAIBHA CERAMICS PRIVATE LIMITED, SECTOR-24 FARIDABAD.

Present : —

Shri R. L. Sharma for the workman.

Shri Balraj Singh Tyagi for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/1039-G-77/22262, dated 22nd May, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Pratibha Ceramics Private Limited, Sector 24, Faridabad and its workman Shri Rameshwari Parshad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 : —

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rameshwari Parshad was justified and in order?
If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The representative for the workman stated that the workman has left away after receiving his full and final account and he did not want to proceed with the reference. In view of the statement for the workman, I give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 28th July, 1979

Presiding Officer, Industrial,
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 717 dated the 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer, Industrial,
Tribunal Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/8633.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Nizam International Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM, SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 123 of 1978.

between

SMT. RITA, WORKER LADY AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. NIZAM
INTERNATIONAL, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the worker lady.

None, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/17346, dated 4th May, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Nizam International, Mathura Road Faridabad and its worker lady Smt Rita, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Smt. Rita was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is she entitled ?”

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman appeared but the management did not appear as the management could not be served. The workman obtained eight-nine adjournments for effecting service on the management. The workman had given another address of the management also but on that address also none on behalf of the management was residing. Finally it was ordered that the workman shall get service of notice effected on the management on 2nd July, 1979. On 2nd July, 1979 none appeared for the worker lady. The conduct of the worker lady or her representative rendered the case liable to dismissal in default. It was, therefore, dismissed in default. I, therefore give my award that there is no dispute between the parties at present.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 24th July, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 716, dated the 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/8635.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Prince Potteries, Bahadurgarh :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 49 of 1978

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PRINCE POTTERIES.
BAHADURGARH.

Present :—

Shri Dhan Singh, for the workmen.

Shri Darshan Singh, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/589-77/8035, dated 20th February, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Prince Potteries, Bahadurgarh and its workmen to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of bonus for the year 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 ? If so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workmen who are working in making glazing, Handel, packing and Sorting departments are entitled to higher piece rate than being given by the management ? If so, with what details ?
3. Whether the grades and scales of the workmen should be framed ? If, so, with what details ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. The management filed their documents with the balance sheet and profit and loss accounts, etc. Lastly the case was fixed for the evidence of the parties, on 23rd July, 1979. On 23rd July, 1979, the management appeared but none appeared for the workmen. The management produced a settlement Ex-M-1. As per the settlement, the workmen have admitted that the management have paid bonus to them for the years mentioned in the order of reference at 8.33%. As regards dispute No. 2, settlement stated that there was no piece rate in the factory, hence the question of enhancement of piece rate does not arise. The workmen withdraw this dispute.

As regards dispute No. 3 regarding grades and scales of the workmen, the settlement read that the workmen were paid as per the Minimum Wages Act applicable in Haryana and the workmen have withdrawn their demands after full satisfaction. In view of the settlement and non appearance of the workmen on the last date of hearing, I give my award as follows:—

1. Bonus at 8.33% for the years 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 has been paid to the workmen which they have admitted. The workmen are not entitled to any relief in respect of dispute No. 2 and 3, as they have withdrawn these demands and disputes.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 724, dated the 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8636.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Tul Par Machine Tool Company, Plot No. 120, Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 143 of 1979

between

SHRI RAMPAL YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. TUL PAR
MACHINE TOOL COMPANY, PLOT No. 120, SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri K.L. Sharma, for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/16-79/18234, dated 3rd May, 1979 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Tul Par Machine Tool Company, Plot No. 120, Sector 6, Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Pal Yadav, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Pal Yadav was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman appeared but the management did not appear despite service of notice. The management was proceeded against ex-parte. And the case was fixed for ex-parte evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as his own witness and stated that he was working with the management since 5th October, 1978 and the management terminated his services without any cause and justification.

I, believe in the ex-parte statement of the workman and give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

The 28th July, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 723, dated the 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8638.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Ajay Enterprises Ltd., Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 211 of 1978

between

SHRI SHAMBHU NARAIN SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
AJAY ENTERPRISES LTD., SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri M. P. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. FD/14-N-78/31652, dated 11th July, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Ajay Enterprises Ltd., Sector 6, Faridabad and its workman Shri Shambhu Narain Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shambhu Narain Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The representative for the management had stated that the workmen was not here at Faridabad and had gone away and the workman did not want to pursue his dispute. The representative for the workman was, therefore, directed to produce the workman in person. On the date of appearance neither the workman appeared nor his representative which led me to form an opinion that the workman was not interested in pursuing his dispute and has left for good. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties at present.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

The 28th July, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 721, dated 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8639.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Moga Engineering and Manufacturing Company Pvt. Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM, SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 393 of 1978

between

SHRI GOPAL BAHADUR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MOGA ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY PVT., LTD. MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri Suresh Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/123-78/39936, dated 30th August, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Moga Engineering and Manufacturing Company Pvt. Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman. Shri Gopal Bahadur, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gopal Bahadur was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The management stated that the name of the management was wrong in the order of reference. The representative for the workman prayed for adjournment for moving the appropriate Government for amendment of the name of management. He obtained several adjournments for this purpose. Lastly the representative for the workman stated that he withdraws the dispute as the management has been described by a wrong name and he shall raise a fresh dispute in the correct name of the management and he sought permission thereof. Permission was granted to him to withdraw the dispute. In these circumstances, I give my award that at present there is no dispute between the parties as described in the order of reference. Further the workman is permitted to raise a fresh dispute as and when he likes against the correct name of the management.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 28th July, 1979.

No. 720, dated 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11 (112)-3Lab-79/8643.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Suman Engineering Works, Sector-24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 26 of 1979

between

SHRI RAGHUBAR RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SUMAN
ENGINEERING WORKS, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present —

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 11/185-78/1111, dated 8th January, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Suman Engineering Works, Sector-24, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Raghubar Ram, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raghubar Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman filed his claim statement and the case was fixed for filing written statement by the management. On the last date of hearing, the management appeared but none appeared for the workman. The case was called thrice and the case was dismissed in default. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties, at present.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 726, dated 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8644.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Eagle Transport (Madras) Ltd., Mathra Road Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 112 of 1979

between

SHRI RAM NARYANA MISRA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S EAGLE
TRANSPORT (MADRAS) LTD, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Pasham Singh, for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 14260, dated 27th March, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Eagle Transport (Madras) Ltd, Muttura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Narain, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Narayan was justified and in order. If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman appeared but the management did not appear. Although the case was called thrice and it was at 11.35 A. M., the management was ordered to be proceeded against *ex parte* and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as his own witness and gave statement that the management terminated his services without any notice or enquiry and without any cause or justification. His work was satisfactory. I believe in the *ex parte* statement of the workman and give my award that the workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

Dated the 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 725, dated the 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8650.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s East India Cotton Mfg. Ltd., Industrial Area, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

References Nos. 55 & 56 of 1979

between

SARVSHRI SUKHARI AND KALIKA PRASHAD, WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S EAST INDIA COTTON MFG. LTD. INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

Present.—

workman in person.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 11/8/79/5155, dated 3rd February, 1979, and 11/8-78/5131, dated 3rd February, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. East India Cotton Mfg. Ltd., Industrial Area, Faridabad and its workman S/Shri Sukhari and Kalika Prashad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Sukhari and Kalika Prashad were justified and in order ? If not, to what relief are they entitled ?

On receipt of order of references, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. The case was fixed for filing written statement by the management, who filed it together with a copy of settlement, which was entered into before Shri Dharmandra Nath, Deputy Labour Commissioner, under section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act and pleaded the bar of that settlement. The settlement reads that 8 workmen, two suspended and six dismissed, shall be taken back on duty with continuity of service but without back wages. The management had reinstated them with continuity of service. The workmen admitted reinstatement with continuity of services but stated that they wanted back wages only to which the settlement was a bar. The settlement is signed by 17-18 workmen, representatives for the workmen. It was entered into by the union named Textile Mazdoor Sangh affiliated to Bhartiya Mazdoor Sangh.

In view of the settlement I give my award that the management have reinstated the workmen with continuity of service as per the said settlement. The workmen are not entitled to back wages as per the settlement.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 738, dated 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8651.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Barar Lion Tools Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 10, 11, 12 and 13 of 1979

between

S/SHRI JAGAR NATH, VIJAY KUMAR, RAM JANAM AND GANGU, WORKMEN
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BARAR LION TOOLS PVT. LTD.,
FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workmen.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

By order No. F/133-78/888, dated 6th January, 1979, Fd/125-78/960, dated 6th January, 1979, FD/133-78/394, dated 6th January, 1979, Fd/133-75/900, dated 6th January, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s. Barar Lion Tools Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad

and its workmen S/Shri Jagar Nath, Vijay Kumar, Ram Janam and Gangu, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Sarvshri Jagar Nath, Vijay Kumar, Ram Janam and Gangu was justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

On receipt of the order of references, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. On 24th May, 1979 the representative for the management did not appear when the case was called. But at 12-30 p.m. the representative for the management Shri A. T. Dass appeared and noted the next date of appearance 12th June, 1979. On 12th June, 1979 none appeared for the management although the case was called thrice and at 11-30 a.m. when the case was called lastly, and the representative for the management did not appear, *ex parte* proceeding against the management were ordered and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workmen on 6th July, 1979. On 6th July, 1979 the workmen and his representative appeared but the management did not appear. The workmen examined himself as their own witnesses. They stated that the management terminated their services without any justification or cause, without issuing any charge-sheet or notice and they may be reinstated with continuity of service and with full back wages.

I believe in the *ex parte* statement of the workmen given on oath and give my award that the termination of services of the workmen were neither justified nor in order. They are entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages.

Dated 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 737, dated 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8652.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Amar Son Pal & Co., N.I.T., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 125 of 1979

between

SHRIMATI SATYA WANTI, WORKER LADY AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S. AMAR SON PAL AND CO., NIT, PARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Bhim Singh Yadav, for the workman.

None for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/11/19-79/16006, dated 11th April, 1979 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Amar Son Pal and Co., NIT, Faridabad and its worker lady Smt. Satya Wanti, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Satya Wanti was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The representative for the workman stated that the worker lady has left for good after receiving all his accounts and he did not like to proceed with the reference. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

The 28th July, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 736, dated 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8653—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Promain Ltd., Mathru Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 108 of 1978

between

SHRI KRISHAN WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. PROMAIN LTD., MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Present.—

Shri P. K. De for the workman.

Shri K. P. Aggarwal for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/17237, dated the 4th May, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Promain Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Krishan, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Krishan was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed on 8th September, 1978 :—

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order ?
2. Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri D. N. Ahuja, their Manager as MW-1, who deposed that the factory was closed from 1st November, 1978, None was on their rolls thereafter. He proved Exhibit M-1 to M-4 and M-5. He deposed that they discharged the workman simplicitor after the expiry of the probation period. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself who stated that he worked for one year and 19 days and his pay was Rs. 425 p.m. His work was satisfactory. He was removed from service on 31st December, 1977. Other workmen were

paid 1½ months' wages at the time of termination of services. The workman admitted that the management has shifted all their machines to Calcutta. He further admitted that the factory of the management was closed for the last three months prior to 13th February, 1979. Then the case was fixed for arguments. Arguments were heard at length,

Vide Exhibit M-1 the workman was appointed for six months on probation and the services of the workman shall be liable to be terminated without any notice of either side during the period of probation. Exhibit M-2, M-3 and M-4 are the appraisal records of the workman on proper proforma. They are signed by Section Incharge and head of the department. The performance of duty by the workman is shown to be very poor. Exhibit M-5 is the letter terminating the services of the workman and asking him to collect his dues. The workman admitted the closure of the factory. The workman alleged that he was removed from service on 31st December, 1977. The workman has further admitted that the management has shifted all their machines to Calcutta and the factory was closed for the last three months. He further submitted that other workmen were paid 1½ months' wages at the time of termination of services but his wages for one month were still unpaid to him. He also stated that the management had paid retrenchment compensation earlier to the closure also. Exhibit M-1 is the appointment letter, dated 1st January, 1977, according to which the workman performed one year service, because he was removed from service on and from 31st December, 1977. It is not in dispute that the factory is closed. Therefore, the question of reinstatement of the workman does not arise. When all the machines have been shifted to Calcutta and no work is going on here at Faridabad, I cannot reinstate the workman concerned.

MW-1 stated in cross-examination that the work of the workman was not satisfactory during the period of his probation.

The management terminates the service of this workman just on the completion of a year and just on expiry of the probation period and the work of the workman was not satisfactory.

In these circumstances, the management were well within their right to terminate the services of the workman. I, therefore, decide issue NO. 1 in favour of the management. As far as relief is concerned, the workman is not entitled to any relief. While answering the reference, I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

Dated, the 31st July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 735, dated the 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8654.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bata India, Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Complaint No. 66 of 1978 under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

between

SHRI RAM CHADER, COMPLAINANT WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S BATA INDIA LTD., FARIDABAD.

Present:—

None for the workman.

Shri C.M. Lal and Shri K.B. Sakhuja for the management.

AWARD

On receipt of the complaint, notices to the management, the opposite party were sent who appeared and filed their pleadings. The workman had obtained adjournment for filing rejoinder. He had taken 6-7 adjournments for filing rejoinder but he did not file. Lastly none appeared for the workman. The representative for the management appeared who argued that the complaint may be dismissed in default of appearance. It was a complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act. In view of non-appearance by the workman, complainant, or his representative, I dismiss the complaint. No orders as to costs.

Dated, the 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 734, dated 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8637.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Machelec, 17/6, Delhi Road, Gurgaon:—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 50 of 1979

between

SHRI GURBACHAN SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MACHELEC,
17/6, DELHI ROAD, GURGAON

Present :—

None for the workman.

Shri S. K. Yadav for the management.

AWARD

By order No. JD/GG/2-79/4551, dated 31st January, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Mechelec, 17/6, Delhi Road, Gurgaon, and its workman Shri Gurbachan Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gurbachan Singh was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. On the last date of hearing none appeared for the workman. Although the management appeared through representative Shri S. K. Yadav who pleaded the settlement arguing that the settlement was given by the workman. He also produced a receipt executed by the workman for a sum of Rs 2,500. In these circumstances, I am of the opinion that the workman has settled his dispute,—*vide* Exhibit M. 1 and has received a sum of Rs 2,500,—*vide* Exhibit M. 2. In view of the said settlement and non-appearance of the workman, I give my award that termination of services of the workman was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief. He has already received a sum of Rs 2,500 from the management.

Dated the 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 722, dated the 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/3640.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Deepak Tools (P) Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 200 of 1976

between

SHRI GANESH PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. DEEPAK
TOOLS (P) LTD., FARIDABAD.

Present:—

Shri R. L. Sharma, for the workman.

None, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/1073-C-76/34518, dated 21st September, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Deepak Tools (P) Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Ganesh Parshad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ganesh Parshad was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed on 4th May, 1977:—

1. Whether the workman served the management with a demand notice properly ? If not, to what effect ?
2. Whether the workman lost his lien by absenting himself for 10 consecutive days as per Model Standing Orders ?
3. Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman obtained seven adjournments and on 27th March, 1978, the representative for the workman examined himself and produced Ex. W-1 the demand notice and closed his case on issue No. 1. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management was not served for five times. Lastly the management was served hence *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management at 2.15 p. m. after calling the case thrice when the management had not appeared. The case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The management thereafter made an application to set aside *ex parte* proceedings against them which set aside subject to payment of costs Rs. 40/- only which has been paid. The management then obtained an adjournment which was granted to them subject to payment of costs Rs. 50/- only and the case was fixed for 3rd July, 1979 for the evidence of the management, on which the management again defaulted in appearance and did not appear. Again the management was proceeded *ex parte* and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidences of the workman. The workman examined himself as his own witness and stated that his services were terminated without any cause or justification and was unemployed since the termination of his services. I, believe in the *ex parte* statement of the workman and give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

Dated the 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 729, dated the 3rd August, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8642.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Deepak Tools (P) Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 201 of 1976

between

SHRI NATHU SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DEEPAK TOOLS (P) LTD.,
FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri R. L. Sharma, for the workman.

None, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/1073-A-76/34606, dated the 21st September, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Deepak Tools (P) Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Nathu Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Nathu Singh, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed on 4th May, 1977 :—

1. Whether the workman served the management with a demand notice properly? If not, to what effect.
2. Whether the workman lost his lien by absenting himself for 10 consecutive days as per Model Standing Orders?
3. Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman obtained seven adjournments and on 27th March, 1978 the representative for the workman examined himself and produced Exhibit W-1 the demand notice and closed his case on issue No. 1. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management was not served for five times. Lastly the management was served hence *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management at 2.15 p.m. after calling the case thrice when the management had not appeared. The case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The management thereafter made an application to set aside *ex parte* proceedings against them which were set aside subject to payment of costs Rs 40 only which has been paid. The management then obtained an adjournment which was granted to them subject to payment of costs Rs. 50 only and the case was fixed for 3rd July, 1979 for the evidence of the management, on which the management again defaulted in appearance and did not appear. Again the management was proceeded *ex parte* and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as his own witness and stated that his services were terminated without any cause or

ustification and was unemployed since the termination of his services. I, believe in the *ex parte* statement of the workman and give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

The 28th July, 1979.

NATHU RAM, SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 727, dated the 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required by section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/8645.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Ms/ Victory Trading Corporation, NIT, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 400 of 1978

between

SHRI BHAGWAN DUTT, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VICTORY TRADING
CORPORATION, N. I. T. FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Darshan Singh for the workman.

Shri K. Malik, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/11/141-48/40007, dated 31st August, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Victory Trading Corporation, NIT Faridabad and its workman Shri Bhagwan Dutt to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of the sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

“Whether the termination of services of the workman Shri Bhagwan Dutt was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief his he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The dispute was settled. The workman received his full and final accounts from the management and gave a statement that he withdraws his dispute. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 28th July, 1979.

No. 733, dated 3rd August, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.